

REMARKS

Applicant hereby responds to the Office Action of January 3, 2006, in which the Examiner rejected all of pending Claims 1-20. More particularly, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-14, and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,686,649 to Matthews, et al. (hereinafter “MATTHEWS”). Furthermore, the Examiner rejected Claims 4 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over MATTHEWS in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0020502 to Sugihara, et al. (hereinafter “SUGIHARA”). The Examiner also rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over MATTHEWS in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,178 to Okabe, et al. (hereinafter OKABE). For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all of Claims 1-20 are allowable over the record, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of such claims.

1. *Amendment Summary*

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 13, 14 and 16-20, cancelled Claim 15, and added new independent Claim 21 into prosecution.

2. *Independent Claims 1 and 13 as Amended are not Anticipated by MATTHEWS*

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that MATTHEWS teaches all of the features recited in Claims 1 and 13. The Examiner particularly points out that MATTHEWS discloses a semiconductor package having a “package body 154... disposed on the film layer 102 and extending to the peripheral edge thereof, the package body 154 covering the semiconductor die 104, the upper leads 110, the transmission line elements 136, and the top film surface 102U...”

Applicant respectfully submits that as a preliminary matter, the element that the Examiner refers to as the “package body 154” is a dielectric cap which is dissimilar both structurally and functionally to the package body recited in Claim 1. More particularly, MATTHEWS teaches a shield 152 which cooperates with the dielectric cap 154 to prevent internal electronic components 104, 186, 188 and 190 from receiving unwanted radiation from an antenna 156, and from emanating unwanted radiation (col. 9, lines 55-62). In this

regard, the shield 152 forms a ground plane spaced apart from the antenna 156 by the dielectric cap 154 (col. 9, lines 40-44).

As currently amended, Claim 1 recites “*...a package body disposed on the film layer and extending to the peripheral edge thereof, the package body encapsulating the semiconductor die, the upper leads, and the transmission line element, and being adhered to the top film surface.*” Claim 13 as amended recites “*...a package body encapsulating the upper leads and the transmission line elements, the package body being disposed on the top film surface and defining a plurality of generally vertical body side surfaces which are substantially coplanar with respective ones of the film side surfaces.*”

Applicant respectfully submits that the feature of encapsulating electronic components with the package body in the context of independent Claims 1 and 13 as amended is neither taught nor suggested by MATTHEWS. MATTHEWS, as considered above, describes a dielectric cap 154, a shield 152, and an antenna 156 merely covering the semiconductor die 104. It is submitted that the term “encapsulating” is understood in the art to refer to a molding which contiguously surrounds one or more components, and is distinguished from the covering provided by the shield 152 of MATTHEWS. Indeed, given the particularized function performed by the dielectric cap 154 in conjunction with the shield 152, namely, the forming of the ground plane on the shield 152, it would be implausible to encapsulate the electronic components 104, 186, 188, and 190 of MATTHEWS as would be necessary to satisfy the features recited in Claims 1 and 13 as amended. Along these lines, Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of MATTHEWS fail to support any hypothetical modification of the transceiver package 100 thereof as would result in the encapsulation of the electronic components 104, 186, 188, and 190.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that because MATTHEWS does not teach or suggest the feature of a package body “encapsulating” electronic components on a non-conductive film layer, Claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated thereby. Applicant therefore submits that Claims 1 and 13 are each in condition for allowance. As Claims 2-12, 14 and 16-20 depend from respective allowable base claims and recite additional features which further define the present invention, it is submitted that such claims are also in condition for allowance.

Application No.: 10/812,274
Response to Office Action of January 3, 2006
Attorney Docket: AMKOR-022CB1

3. New Independent Claim 21 is not Anticipated by MATTHEWS

Similar to amended Claims 1 and 13, new independent Claim 21 recites “*...a package body encapsulating the semiconductor die, the upper leads and the transmission line element, the package body being disposed on the top film surface and defining a plurality of generally vertical body side surfaces and a generally horizontal body top surface which is substantially orthogonal to the body side surfaces.*” Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 21 is also in condition for allowance for the same reasons discussed above in relation to amended independent Claims 1 and 13.

4. Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present invention meets the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of Claims 1-14 and 16-21 of the present application. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 19-4330.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/2/06 By:

Customer No.: 007663



Mark B. Garred
Registration No. 34,823
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER
75 Enterprise, Suite 250
Aliso Viejo, California 92656
Telephone: (949) 855-1246
Fax: (949) 855-6371